

REMARKS**Interview Summary**

Applicants' Attorney, N. Scott Pierce, would like to thank the Examiner for conducting the telephonic interview of October 24, 2007, and for her helpful comments. During the interview, Applicants' proposed claim amendments were discussed.

The Examiner indicated that she will accept Applicants' proposed claim amendments, in which Claim 64 will be amended to include subject matter of Claim 93 to narrow the scope of Claim 64. In addition, dependent claims that were dependent from Claim 93 will be amended to depend from Claim 64.

Amendments to the Claims

Claim 93 has been canceled. Claim 64 has been amended to more clearly define "substituted or unsubstituted phenol" by incorporating the subject matter of Claim 93. Support for this amendment is found throughout the specification, for example, at page 9, lines 8-23. Claims 65, 70, 71 and 74 have been amended to properly depend from Claim 64. Claims 94, 98, 99, 104 and 106-109, which were dependent from Claim 93, have been amended to depend from Claim 64.

No new matter has been added.

Rejection of Claims 64-77 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Claims 64-77 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner stated that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The Examiner further stated that Applicant does not teach any and all substituted or unsubstituted phenols and it is not clear whether applicant intends antioxidant phenols and what is encompassed by "substituted or unsubstituted phenols."

Claim 64 has been amended to more clearly define what is encompassed by "substituted or unsubstituted phenols" by incorporating Structural Formula (XXIX) from Claim 93. The

specification as filed teaches a number of representative substituted or unsubstituted phenols encompassed by Structural Formula (XXIX). See Structural Formulas (V), (VI), (XXVI), (XXVII) and (XXVIII) at page 26, line 15 through page 27, line 2. In addition, the specification as filed teaches methods of polymerization including enzymatic or non-enzymatic methods, at page 22, line 18 though page 23, line 18; conditions for polymerization, such as pH, temperature, solvents and concentration of monomers to be used, at page 23, line 19 through page 24, line 16; possible protecting groups for hydroxyl groups at page 25, lines 6-15; and deprotection methods at page 25, lines 26-28.

Therefore, the specification provides enabling disclosure for one skilled in the art to make and/or use Applicants' claimed invention as set forth in Claim 64 and its dependent claims as amended and these claims meet the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Information Disclosure Statement

An Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) is being filed concurrently herewith. Entry of the IDS is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON BROOK SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By _____
N. Scott Pierce
Registration No. 34,900
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133
Date:

11/9/01